

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 12-14, 15, and 19-21 are pending in the application.
Dependent claims 11 and 18 have been canceled in this Response.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended to recite a web “server” in accordance with Examiner’s suggestion. It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 1, under 35 U.S.C. §112 has been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 11-15, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,990,526 to Zhu (hereinafter “Zhu”). Independent claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended to recite that the present invention comprises a database server that detects the execution of database triggers and, in response to detection of execution of a database trigger, is further operable to set a flag to a value indicating that the version of the web page stored on a web server is not the most current version of the requested web page. Database triggers, as used in the present invention, are discussed in Applicants’ specification on page 5, line 12 continuing to page 6, line 4 and on page 8, lines 4-25.

In the current office action, Examiner states that the Zhu reference discloses a database server that is operable to detect the execution of a database trigger. In support of this proposition, Examiner refers to the coherency management module discussed in Zhu in column 3, lines 36-48. However, Zhu does not discuss database triggers in column 3, lines 36-48, nor is there any discussion of database triggers elsewhere in the Zhu reference.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that Zhu does not anticipate Applicants invention as recited in independent claims 1, 8, and 18, and, therefore the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) has been overcome. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 4-6, 12-14, and 19-21 are allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
September 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary W. Hamilton/

Gary W. Hamilton
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,834